



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/749,421	12/31/2003	Jos Jaspers	14012-051001/50-03-009	9571
26230 7590 03/09/2009 FISH & RICHARDSON P.C. P.O. BOX 1022 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022				
EXAMINER				
SHIH, HAOSHIAN				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2173				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
03/09/2009		ELECTRONIC		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

PATDOCTC@fr.com

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/749,421

**Applicant(s)**

JASPERS ET AL.

**Examiner**

HAOSHIAN SHIH

**Art Unit**

2173

**Period for Reply** -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12/17/2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 3, 4, 8, 10-20 and 22-27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 3-4, 8, 10-20 and 22-27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/S508)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 1, 3-4, 8, 10-20 and 22-27 are pending in this application and have been examined in response to application RCE filed on 12/17/2008.

2.

#### ***Claim Objections***

3. Claim 1 recites the limitation "...parameters for each of the plurality;" on line 8.

The recited limitation appears to be missing additional words.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 27 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

5. Claim 27 recites the limitation "the library of components". The limitation is not disclosed in the parent claims.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

**7. Claims 1, 3-4, 8, 10-20 and 22-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being unpatentable by Underwood et al. (Underwood, US 7,152,207 B1).**

8. As to **INDEPENDENT** claim 1, Underwood discloses a method comprising: presenting a list of different selectable components used to generate Web pages and associated configurable parameters for each of the components (col.13, lines 1-5; fig.5-10; a list of components is displayed for defining a web site).

receiving a selection of a plurality of the different selectable components and values for associated configurable parameters for each of the plurality parameters for the web environment (col.13, lines 15-19; the users are allowed to configure a web site via components presented via a "Web Definer");

automatically generating a Web page based at least in part, on the received selection of the plurality of the different selectable components and the received parameter values, wherein the Web page presents the plurality of the different selectable components in accordance with the received parameter values (fig.11, "660"; the defined site is created via the "Create" button);

receiving a request to publish content in the Web page (fig.13, "1305"; a user publishes new content via "Add Pages");

presenting, in response to the request to publish content, a content definition user interface adapted to receive an identification of content (fig.16, a user names the newly created page and selects a page layout);

publishing the identified content in accordance with a predefined presentation format (col.15, lines 54-57); and

receiving data corresponding to a request to navigate to a particular location within the Web page, wherein the request to publish content is received in connection with a display of the particular location on a user interface and the identified content is published at the particular location (fig.15; col.15, lines 30-35; a user selects a particular location in the hierarchy of the site map to publish additional web pages)

9. As to claim 3, Underwood discloses the form comprises a plurality of entry fields, with each entry field corresponding to one of the different selectable components (fig.9, "635"; a list of selectable components is presented via a drop down menu).

10. As to claim 4, Underwood discloses the generated Web page is based on a template defining a presentation format for the generated Web page (col.12, lines 30-35; "template").

11. As to claim 8, Underwood discloses the particular location comprises a folder within a displayed folder hierarchy, with the folder hierarchy corresponding to a logical structure of the Web page (fig.14, "1405").

12. As to claim 10, Underwood discloses the different selectable components comprise web page components, with each web page component defining a presentation format for data on a web page (col.15, lines 60-65).
13. As to claim 11, see rationale addressed in the rejection of claim 6 above.
14. As to claim 12, Underwood discloses the content includes at least one link to a web page (col.7, lines 1-5; "links").
15. As to claim 13, Underwood discloses receiving a request to modify a logical structure of the Web page; modifying the logical structure of the Web page in accordance with the request to modify the logical structure (col.15, lines 30-50; options such as adding a page and deleting a page are provided); and  
updating the at least one link in accordance with the modified logical structure (col.15, lines 55-56).
16. As to **INDEPENDENT** claim 14, see rationale addressed in the rejection of claim 1 above.
17. As to claim 15, Underwood discloses the presented user interface comprises a form adapted to allow a user to configure the parameters (fig.6-11).

18. As to claim 16, see rationale addressed in the rejection of claim 3 above.
19. As to claim 17, see rationale addressed in the rejection of claim 4 above.
20. As to claim 18, see rationale addressed in the rejection of claim 1 above.
21. As to claim 19, see rationale addressed in the rejection of claim 1 above.
22. As to claim 20, see rationale addressed in the rejection of claim 8 above.
23. As to claim 22, see rationale addressed in the rejection of claim 10 above.
24. As to claim 23, see rationale addressed in the rejection of claim 18 above.
25. As to claim 24, see rationale addressed in the rejection of claim 12 above.
26. As to claim 25, see rationale addressed in the rejection of claim 13 above.
27. As to claim 26, Underwood discloses wherein the templates include templates for at least one of different countries, different organizational sites, intranet sites,

extranet sites, or internet sites (fig.9, "635"; different industry types such as "General" and "Manufacturing" are disclosed).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

28. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

**29. Claim 27 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Underwood and Maeno et al. (Maeno, US 7,299,414 B2).**

30. As to claim 27, Underwood does not disclose different language components to allow a user to selectively switch among different languages for presentation in generated Web page.

In the same field of endeavor, Maeno discloses different language components to allow a user to selectively switch among different languages for presentation in generated web environment (Abstract).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teaching of Underwood and Maeno before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the



web designer taught by Underwood to include multilingual pack taught by Maeno with the motivation being to allow an appropriate language format responsive to the user's need (col.2, lines 30-33).

### ***Response to Arguments***

31. Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 1 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to HAOSHIAN SHIH whose telephone number is (571)270-1257. The examiner can normally be reached on m-f 0730-1700.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kieu Vu can be reached on (571) 272-4057. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

HSS

/Kieu D Vu/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2175